REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on

June 19, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1, 2, 4-

10 and 23-30 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants

have: 1) amended claims 1 and 23; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled

claims 2, 10, 29 and 30. As such, claims 1, 4-9, 23-28 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the

allowance of all claims now presented.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 23 - 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Enger, et al. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0020325 (hereinafter

"Enger").

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23, as amended, is allowable

over Enger. Specifically, Enger does not disclose or suggest a motion sensor to

detect the orientation of the data processing device, wherein the data processing

device automatically switches from a first operational mode to a second

operational mode in response to the motion sensor detecting the data

processing device switching from a first physical orientation to a second physical

orientation and wherein text and graphics are rotated 90 degrees as the display

is rotated from the first physical orientation to the second physical orientation.

In fact, Enger teaches away from a the use of a motion sensor – relying instead on a plurality of "Hall effect" switches to detect the position of the display in relation to the data processing device body. See, e.g., Figures 1-2 of Enger. As described in Enger, "Hall-effect switches are used to detect whether the flip cover 104 is in the portrait configuration, the landscape configuration, or the closed configuration." Enger, page 3, para [0025]. In short, a Hall effect switch is not a motion sensor and is not capable (as is a motion sensor) of detecting the orientation of the data processing device as claimed in Claim 23. Rather, a Hall switch is only capable of detecting the relative position of the display in relation to the data processing device body.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enger, et al. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0020325 in view of Lee, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0107119 (hereinafter "Lee"). Claims 29 and 30 have been cancelled. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 103 rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims 1,2 and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke-Anlauff, U.S. Patent No. 6,850,226 (hereinafter "Finke-Anlauff"), in view of Saarinen, U.S. Patent No. 6,882,335 (hereinafter "Saarinen") and Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke-Anlauff, U.S. 6,850,226, in view of Saarinen,

U.S. 6,882,335 in further view of Enger, et al. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0020325.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended is allowable over Finke-Anlauff and Saarinen. Specifically, neither Finke-Anlauff nor Saarinen teach or suggest

> a first <u>plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard, each of the first plurality of glyphs</u> representing a designated one of the first specified functions, the first <u>plurality of glyphs</u> being highlighted when the data processing device is in the first operational mode; and
> a second <u>plurality of glyphs on the plurality of physical keys of the alphanumeric keyboard, each of the second plurality of glyphs</u> representing a designated one of the second specified functions, the second <u>plurality of glyphs</u> being highlighted when the data processing device is in the second operational mode, wherein the data processing device automatically highlights the first <u>plurality of glyphs</u> when in the first operational mode and automatically highlights the second <u>plurality of glyphs</u> when in the second operational mode.

The data processing device in Saarinen displays a keyboard on the data processing device's display. As described in Saarinen "in the landscape mode, it will display an image, a keyboard across a landscape oriented display, and in the portrait mode will display an image of a keyboard across a portrait oriented display." Saarinen, col. 16, lines 12-15. Displaying a keyboard on a display is very different from highlighting different glyphs on a set of physical keyboard keys based on a data processing device's operational mode. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are dependent claims which include the same features as the independent claims above as well as additional features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9/19/07

Thomas C. Webster
Reg. No.: 46,154

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300